



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/469,904	12/22/1999	THEODORE K BULLOCK	TN170	5514

7590 03/28/2005

ROCCO L. ADORNATO  
UNISYS CORPORATION  
UNISYS WAY MS/E8-114  
BLUE BELL, PA 19424-0001

EXAMINER

QUELER, ADAM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/469,904

Applicant(s)

BULLOCK ET AL.

Examiner

Adam M Queler

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 18-27, 29-38 and 40-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4, 11, 17, 28 and 39 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment filed 12/30/2004.
2. Claims 1-42 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37 are independent claims.
3. In response to Applicant's request for supervisory approval for the previous reopening of prosecution, the signing of this action by a Supervisor should be taken as that approval.
4. The objection to claim 1 is withdrawn in response to Applicant's amendment.
5. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 is withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment.

### ***Claim Objections***

6. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: On the last line of claim 1, "sever-side" and "of" appear to be switched. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. **Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 12-16, 18-22, 26-27, 29-33, 37-38, 40-42 are rejected under 35**

**U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fields et al. (US006412008B1, filed 1/28/1999)**

**Regarding independent claim(s) 1, 8, 15, 26, and 37,** Fields discloses a master web site (col. 4,

ll. 1-3). From the description in the specification (p. 10, ll. 10-26, and p. 11, line 25 – p.12 line

6), "hosting" is broadly interpreted to include having the means to supply the requested web site.

Fields discloses a first class of user, a system administrator that is able to customize according to

Art Unit: 2179

a first level of customizability, such as corporate options (col. 5, ll. 45-47). Fields teaches that when non user options are set, the file is customized according to the account holder's customizations, therefore hosting a separate copy of copy of the master web site (col. 7, ll. 19-24). Fields teaches a second class of user, an individual user (col. 5, ll. 47-48), that has a second level of customizability, personal options (col. 2, ll. 50-52). Fields teaches that both levels of customizability are done server-side (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 1).

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 2, 9, 16, 27 and 38,** Fields teaches a web page with links, and is therefore a portal (Fig. 10).

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 5, 12, 18, and 29 and 40,** Fields teaches a combination of web page elements (Fig. 9).

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 6, 13, 19, 30, and 41,** Fields teaches the second level cannot customize as many options as the second level (col. 5, ll. 46-48). Therefore the first level allows customization of a greater number of elements.

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 7, 14, 20, 31 and 42,** Fields teaches the elements comprise at least text (Fig. 5).

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 21 and 32,** Fields teaches a server connected to a network that transmits the customized copies (Fig. 2).

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 22 and 33,** Fields teaches that the customized copies are dynamically generated (col. 4, ll. 1-14).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2179

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**10. Claims 25 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields.**

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 25 and 36,** Fields teaches customizing a web page as a whole, which would include all of its elements c2.40-46. Official Notice is taken that it was well-known at the time of the invention for any website to comprise hyperlinks, images and scrolling messages. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add these well-known elements to the web page, as they would have been characteristics of an up to date web page.

**11. Claims 3 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of "Accepting Input from a Browser," published 12/8/1999.**

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 3 and 10,** Fields teaches that there are many ways that to send a request and options to a server (col. 4, ll. 51-55). Fields does not explicitly disclose a URL to the hosted copy. Dave teaches that customization information can be passed with variables in the URL (section. 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the URL parameters of Dave, in the request of Fields, thereby assigning a unique URL to the hosted copy. Inherently, the URL must be provided, or the URL would not be known. This combination would have been obvious as it was one of the well-known ways of providing customization options (Dave, para. 1) and thus desired by Fields (col. 4, ll. 51-55).

Art Unit: 2179

**12. Claims 23-24 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields as applied to claim 15 and 26 above, and further in view of Nazem et al. (USPN 5983227—filed 6/12/1997).**

**Regarding dependent claim(s) 23 and 34,** Fields does not explicitly teach a database for storing the information defining the web pages. Nazem teaches a database for storing the information defining web pages (col. 3, ll. 26-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nazem and Fields to provide a database, in order to increase performance by caching the page (Fields, col. 4, ll. 40-47)

**Regarding dependent claim 24 and 35,** Fields does not teach subdirectories. Nazem teaches sub-directories for each user's information (col. 3, ll. 35-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Nazem and Jolt so the each record could be quickly retrieved (Nazem, col. 3, ll. 42-44).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

**13. Claims 4, 11, 17, 28, and 39,** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

**14. Applicant's arguments** filed 12/30/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

**Regarding Applicant's remarks on p. 11:**

Applicant alleges that the personal customization options disclosed by Fields are client-side customizations. While Fields does allow for customization to take place at the client, Fields

Art Unit: 2179

explicitly discloses that both levels of customizability are done server-side (col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 1).

***Conclusion***

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam M Queler whose telephone number is (571) 272-4140. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AQ

  
HEATHER R. HERNDON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100